DOCUMENT RESUME

UD 005 710

ED 022 824

By-Lueptow, Lloyd B.

THE DISADVANTAGED CHILD: PRIMARY GROUP TRAINING FOR SECONDARY GROUP LIFE.

Pub Date Oct 65
Note-10p.
Journal Cit-The Teachers College Journal; v37 n1 p5, 18-25 Oct 1965
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.48
Descriptors-ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, *CULTURAL DIFFERENCES, CULTURE CONFLICT, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, GROUP MEMBERSHIP, INTERACTION, *LOWER CLASS STUDENTS, MIDDLE CLASS NORM, PERSONALITY, ROLE PERCEPTION, ROLE PLAYING, SCHOOL ROLE, SOCIAL INFLUENCES, SOCIALIZATION, *SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, SOCIAL STRUCTURE, SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

A social psychological analysis of the school life of disadvantaged children indicates that conflicts result from the lower-class youngster's need to adjust to the expectations of middle-class society. A review of social psychological theory points to the implication that the cultural conflict is a fundamental one going to the very heart of basic social and personality organization. Moreover, the school as socializer of the disadvantaged child approaches him as a secondary system with expectations of behavior which are incongruent to him. The formulation of a primary-secondary group dichotomy suggests that the academic functioning of the disadvantaged child reflects an inability to become involved in schooling rather than a lack of will. Teachers should be aware of the patterns of social structure discussed here and research might determine the importance of this formulation for academic success. In addition, the school must choose whether to concentrate on the strengths of the primary system of the poor or whether to educate these youngsters toward middle class membership. If the choice is the latter, then in the early grades such techniques as role playing and role taking, and, in the later grades, the study of society would be effective. (NH)

Table of Contents

Theme for this Issue:
TEACHING THE DISADVANTAGED

Introduction 1

Guest Editorial 2
EDUCATION IS THE FOUNDATION
The Honorable Birch Bayh, U.S. Senator From Indiana

Focus on the Needs of All Children
GUIDEPOSTS FOR LOVE AND UNDERSTANDING 3
Clara and Morey Appell

Historical and Social Psychological Factors
SCHOOLING FOR THE CULTURALLY DEPRIVED 4
Harry S. Broudy

THE DISADVANTAGED CHILD: PRIMARY GROUP TRAINING FOR SECONDARY GROUP LIFE 5
Lloyd B. Lueptow

Two Curriculum Proposals
COMPENSATORY LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN 6
Walter J. Moore

CURRICULUM INNOVATIONS FOR DISADVANTAGED ELEMENTARY CHILDREN—WHAT SHOULD THEY BE? 7
Mildred B. Smith

Special Centers for the Disadvantaged
THE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER: A PROGRAM TO PROVIDE CHILDREN A "HEAD START" IN LIFE AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PRIMARY EDUCATION 8
Catherine R. Hudson

THE INDIANAPOLIS CENTER: REPORT ON TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM FOR INDIANAPOLIS PRE-SCHOOL CENTERS 9
Lucille Ingalls

Appeals for Commitment and Sensitivity
THE ELEMENTARY TEACHER AND THE DISADVANTAGED—BUG IN A TUB 10
Paul W. Koester

MORE TENDER HEARTS 11
Clara and Morey Appell

A TEACHER VISITS THE HOMES OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN 12
Ann Williams

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS—
In addition to the writers, several persons have helped in planning and preparing this edition of the **Journal:** the I.S.U. Audio-Visual Department, all pictures except the one from Sen. Bayh's office; Dr. Paul W. Koester, suggestions for most of the writers; and the University's Division of Printing, reproduction services.

The Teachers College Journal of the School of Education is printed at the Indiana State University Division of Printing

THE TEACHERS COLLEGE JOURNAL

VOLUME XXXVII, No. 1, OCTOBER, 1965

editor
JOEL L. BURDIN
Associate Professor of Education

assistant to the editor
SARA ELKINS

editorial associates
CHARLES W. HARDAWAY
Acting Vice-President and Dean of Faculty
MARK NEVILLE
Professor of English
BYRON WESTFALL
Professor of Education

editorial board
ALAN C. RANKIN
President, Indiana State University
WILLIAM E. ENGBRETSON
Dean, School of Education
ARTHUR SCHULZ
Acting Director of Printing Production

The Teachers College Journal seeks to present competent discussions of professional problems in education and toward this end restricts its contributing personnel to those of training and experience in the field. The Journal does not engage in re-publication practice, in belief that previously published material, however creditable, has already been made available to the professional public through its original publication.

Manuscripts concerned with controversial issues are welcome, with the express understanding that all such issues are published without editorial bias or discrimination.

Articles are presented on the authority of their writers, and do not necessarily commit the Journal to points of view so expressed. At all times the Journal reserves the right to refuse publication if in the opinion of the Editorial Board an author has violated standards of professional ethics or journalistic presentation.

Published October, November, December, January, March, and May by Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana. Entered as second-class matter October 5, 1931, at the Post Office at Terre Haute, Indiana, under act of August 24, 1912.

EDUCATIONAL PRESS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Disadvantaged Child: Primary Group Training for Secondary Group Life

by Lloyd B. Lueptow

THIS PAPER will attempt to review some of the factors in the social background and personality of the disadvantaged child that are held by various students of the problem to have an effect upon the school success of these children. In addition, it will attempt an interpretation of some of the evidence, which to the present time has not been adequately exploited. Thus, the following discussion will be more concerned with stating the problem in social psychological terms than it will be with solutions, although some suggestions will be made in conclusions regarding possible ameliorative programs.

In a paper of this length, and in view of the number of different factors involved, it will be impossible to do more than list and briefly describe each of them. For the reader not satisfied with a bare bones approach of this sort, this paper will utilize fairly extensive citations of sources in which more complete discussions can be found.

From a social psychological point of view the basic problem of the disadvantaged is that children who receive their initial training in one subculture are expected to behave satisfactorily in a different one. This is more commonly stated as the problem of lower class children and middle class norms. It is worth noting that this problem is a completely relative one in that the disadvantaged child has problems, not because he is a lower class child, but because there is a middle class system that apprises him and by and large does so negatively.

The school is critical in this process because it is the first major agency of the dominant subculture with which the lower class child has contact (1, 2, 10, 26, 19, 23). Given the nature of the school's social function, its role is contradictory in that it is both a barrier and a channel to the lower class child's entrance into the middle class system. As it applies to the "middle class measuring rod" (10), it operates as a barrier; but as it supplements, modifies, and corrects lower class socialization, it operates as a channel.

DR. LUEPTOW *is an Associate Professor of Sociology, Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana. He was a lecturer for the I.S.U. reading institute for teachers of disadvantaged children, summer,* 1965.

Who Are The Disadvantaged?

Before proceeding any further a word should be said about the disadvantaged population, namely, who are they? This paper, as do others, proposes to beg this question by defining the group in a manner that permits us to draw upon a considerable body of evidence about the American social class structure. Thus, this paper will treat the disadvantaged population as those socioeconomic levels whose children tend to do poorly in school, who are more likely to be underachievers and dropouts, and who terminate their education with high school graduation (11, 26, 29). These socioeconomic levels are those at the bottom of the hierarchical structure, referred to variously as lower class, working class, blue collar, or occasionally simply as the bottom one-fifth. The reader should note, however, that while the disadvantaged are located as empirically distinct subcultural populations within the total social structure, equating them with low socioeconomic status populations is the only feasible approach to the existing evidence. Finally, this paper tends to follow the literature based on occupational structures rather than racial or ethnic structures and will consider the problems of racial minority groups to be different only in degree from those of majority lower class groups. It will assume that the additional burdens imposed upon the individual child by prejudice and discrimination are not qualitatively different in their effects than the burdens imposed by the application of the middle class norms to the lower class personality among all groups. It will assume that social class is more important than race or ethnicity in these processes as it is in socialization (Davis).

The Social Psychological Nature of Disadvantage

Turning now to the social-psychological nature of the lower class disadvantage, it appears that it adopts three forms: (1) the specific content of lower class value-orientations and life

Continued on page 18

ED 005 027

ventions and morality, one because it can afford to defy them, and the other because it has nothing to lose by defying them. In matters of sex, aggression, living for the day, scorn of thrift, disdain for steady employment, love of sensual enjoyment, a desire for moving about, the very loftly and the very low resemble each other more than they do the middle class.

Now while the middle class is still the backbone of the nation, it is also the stuffed shirt of the nation. The mediocrity, the crass materialism, the status hunger, the fear of originality—all of these less admirable traits of the middle class—one should foist upon the culturally deprived with great hesitation. There is a real question here as to who is deprived and of what?

The slum child, it has been shown repeatedly, may be sophisticated within his own *milieu;* he manages shrewdly and well in a hard situation; he is tough and resourceful. It would be a shame to strip him of these admirable qualities in favor of a merely softer and more prolonged infancy. Perhaps our schools can learn from the culturally deprived how to toughen up our culturally replete youngsters and make them more self-reliant, less prone to run to their parents for the latest toy, the latest clothes, the fanciest entertainment, help in their homework, and intercession with the school authorities and even the police.

What I am saying so awkwardly is that our determination to do what we ought to have done long ago for the culturally deprived—or more precisely, what we should have done for ourselves—is a chance to look at ourselves and ask whether we of the middle classes are the true mold by which the unfortunate are to be made fortunate. Is there not a better model? There is, and it is a classless model. That model is a combination of traits hammered out by the wisdom of the ages from the great insights of the Greeks and Jews and the Christians, the science and the literature of the West, not to speak of the wisdom of the East. In this model, I dare say, the solid virtues of thrift, cleanliness, honesty, industry, and dependability will be written large; but I am equally sure that the quickness of mind and hand, the independent spirit of the gamin, the willingness to take life in its immediacy with all of its fresh flavor, the readiness to laugh, to love, and to enjoy the vividness of experience will not be missing. In equalizing educational opportunity, let it be opportunity for the best.

The Disadvantaged Child: Primary Group Training for Secondary Group Life

Continued from page 5

styles differ in significant ways from those of the middle class patterns, (2) compared to middle class performances, lower class socialization is less adequate, (3) the lower class system of interactions and relationships is characterized by what is here termed "primary group relatedness" while the dominant middle class system is one of secondary *as well as* primary interactions and relationships.

Considering first the inappropriate value-orientations and life styles, and following the practice of outlining and citing more detailed references, studies indicate lower class groups differ from middle class in several critical areas. *First*, the lower class child lives in a world where social problems appear with greater frequency than they do in the world of the middle class child (16,23). He is more likely to have viewed and/or experienced familial discord, physical violence, drug addiction, drunkenness, mental illness, crime, and delinquency. In this sense, and probably only in this sense, he comes to the school with a broader range of experiences than does the middle class child. *Secondly*, he lacks the conventional manners and courtesies of the middle class child, especially with respect to the more formalized patterns and the symbolic substitues for physical action (2). *Thirdly*, the occupational value-orientations of the adults differ in ways that devalue occupations and work. Where the middle class father tends to view work as important in itself, and to merge his personality in the occupational role, the lower class father views work as a means to other goals, seldom as an end in itself. Where the middle class father thinks in terms of occupational advancement and success, the lower class father tends to think in terms of security, activity, and the immediate gratification of consumer desires (8, 21). Closely related to the occupational value-orientations are the fourth set of distinguishing factors, the cluster of characteristics described as the achievement syndrome and delayed gratification pattern. Compared to the middle class the lower class is less achievement oriented, less concerned with individual success or with the attainment of high status or of upward mobility as a success goal (9, 14, 17, 25).

The significance of these value-orientations for the child probably centers around the factor of task-orientation. Given the differing adult orientations to occupations, work, and achievement, it is likely that the middle class child will be more task-oriented and possess greater personal competence in task contexts than will the lower class child. Learning and schoolwork are, of course, tasks.

Finally, there is evidence, although not quite as clear as the preceding, that the lower classes devalue education as an end, and value it primarily as a means to occupational success (12). As occupational success aspirations are lower in these groups and as they tend to have a quality of immediacy, the general educational aspirations of these groups are lower than those of the middle class (26). In addition, various restrictions in the perspectives of the lower class populations produce distrust for intellectualism and intellectual activity.

These differences in value-orientations and styles have implications for the meeting of the lower class child and the middle class teacher that are well summarized by Riessman (24) and need not be reviewed here. In addition, the occupational, achievement, and educational value-orientations most likely affect the academic performance of the child, both in terms of the motives, perspectives, and capacities acquired by the child in the family and in the support the school receives from the family.

The evidence on socialization is more difficult to interpret than the literature on value-orientations, but it appears that a legitimate conclusion is that lower class socialization differs both in its content and in its adequacy. As socialization involves the transmission of value-orientations from the parent to the child, the factors outlined in the preceding discussion describe some of the content of lower class socialization. Furthermore, the failure of the parents to instil such factors as achievement motivation in the early years of training is probably determinant and irremedial. The value-orientations, on the other hand, emerging in a context of symbolic interaction, are being acquired at about the age the child enters the elementary grades, and in this respect the school has the opportunity, but certainly not the resources, to supplement or modify parental socialization.

A second aspect of socialization is the transfer of control from the agents of social control to the personality of the socializee through the development of internal controls. It appears that the techniques utilized by the lower class mother are less effective than are those of the middle class mother. The result of this appears to be a greater ability on the part of the middle class to control or inhibit his impulses, and to acquire self-control and responsibility for his own behavior (4, 6, 18). To greatly oversimplify, it appears that the goal of the lower class mother is to teach the child to conform to authority and to be good in the sense of obedience while the middle class mother is more concerned with the development of the child's ability to control his own behavior and to develop personally as well as socially adequate motives (18). From the viewpoint of the school, these differences mean that the middle class child is better equipped to behave in the task-oriented context of the classroom.

If these generalizations are reasonably correct, they have somewhat contradictory implications for the problem of the disadvantaged child. On the one hand they suggest the lower class child is less well equipped to succeed in the school system because of the characteristics he has not acquired. On the other hand, if the lower class socialization is less adequate in the sense of internalizing the features of the culture, then it would appear that the school, as an agency of socialization, could function more successfully. In other words, the potential effects of the school upon the child would appear to be greater for children who have been inadequately socialized. This would, of course, assume that the schools could apply the immense resources necessary to function effectively in this capacity.

The final aspect of the disadvantage of the lower class child is what will be termed here *primary group relatedness.* While there is considerable evidence regarding the class-related nature of this factor, to this writer's knowledge, the implications for the disadvantaged child of these differences have not been developed.

The distinction between "primary" and "secondary" processes has been made by many sociologists using many different terminologies and approaching the problem at different levels of analysis (3, 7, 28). However, the heart of the distinction lies in the differences between systems of action in which the actors have internalized the patterns regulating conduct and consequently behave in terms of features of their internal personality system and, conversely, systems in which the actors behave in terms of the functional requirements of task-oriented systems and the demands imposed by these functions or tasks. This is the basic difference between the sacred and the secular. The distinction can be most easily drawn

by describing the differences at the three levels of generality: behavior, social structure, and culture.

At the behavioral level the distinction has to do basically with the source of motivational arousal. In the primary context, behavior emerges on the basis of the internal needs and motives of the actors as they pursue goals and attempt to elicit rewarding responses from other actors. This is a cathartic problem and constitutes an expressive style of behavior that usually involves a total personality. Secondary behavior emerges on the basis of the functional and task demands of the system or organization. This might be termed "behavior on demand" and involves only that segment of the actor necessary for the exhibition of the performance. From the actor's point of view this behavior is usually instrumental and is not an end in itself. Although it is a considerable oversimplification, it is reasonably correct to view primary behaviors as expressive and secondary behaviors as instrumental. It is worth noting at this point that instrumental behavior requires a degree of self-control that expressive behavior does not and that as the child moves from the family through the educational system he is forced to behave more and more in the instrumental rather than the expressive mode.

At the level of social structure and social interaction, the distinction has been most often made in the vocabulary used here, that is, primary and secondary groups and interactions. Primary groups are generally ends in themselves as they primarily serve as a locus for expressive behaviors. Members participate in these interactions as total personalities and are therefore susceptible to social control throughout all facets of their personality. The combination of the importance of these groups to the person and the scope of the person involved provide the sanctioning power that make these groups powerful agents of social control. Secondary groups, on the other hand, are seldom ends in themselves as, from the actor's point of view, they are usually instrumentalities for the attainment of other goals. (There are important exceptions to this statement that occur when the actor internalizes the patterns of an instrumental role and becomes motivationally committed to the system containing it, as do members of the professions.) As members of secondary groups ordinarily activate only those segments of their person necessary to the specialized performances of the instrumental role, these groups are much less effective in controlling the behavior of the actors. Because the secondary group ordinarily has only instrumental significance to the actor and because the group sanctions can be applied to only a segment of his person, the secondary group is always faced with tendencies toward deviation emanating from internalized needs and those behaviors sanctioned by his primary groups. This problem can most easily be seen in the context of the classroom in the school as a secondary system competes with the peers and the internalized needs of the child for control of the child's behavior. If the internalized norms and peer norms depart markedly from the norms of the secondary system, the outcome of this unequal contest for control of the child's behavior is obvious to everyone.

Finally, this distinction can also be drawn at the level of the cultural patterns themselves. The most expeditious way of putting it is to describe the patterns that define the nature of the relationships of the actors to each other. Note that the concern here is not with the content of the relationship but rather with the dimensions of the relationship itself, the very general factors defining the relevance of the actors to each other. While there may be both theoretical and empirical questions about them, the Parsonian pattern variables purport to describe these major relational dimensions (22). Their relevance for this sort of discussion is that Parsons holds them to be exhaustive of all of the relevant possibilities at this level necessary to define the relationship between actors. In this sense they describe the fundamental and central dimensions relevant to the problem of the involvement of the child with the school as a system.

The pattern variables, grouped by the primary-secondary distinction, are as follows:

primary		*secondary*
affectivity	----	affective neutrality
diffuseness	----	specificity
ascription	----	achievement
particularism	----	universalism
collectivity	----	self-orientation

The affectivity - affective neutrality distinction has been implied in the expressive - instrumental distinction in that it distinguishes situations where gratification can occur (affectivity) from situations where gratification must be postponed (affective neutrality). The former is a situation of cathectic, or expressive primacy, and the latter one of cognitive or instrumental primacy.

Diffuseness - specificity refers to the legitimate scope of the involvement of the actors with each other. The distinction is between broad involvement with the total personality of the other (diffuseness) and a more limited involvement (specifi-

city). The orientation in secondary systems is usually limited to the instrumentally relevant aspects of the other actor, that is, to his specialized performances as described by the label of his status position.

Ascription - achievement refers to the type of characteristics of the other that are to be considered by the actor in relating himself to the other. The choice here is between the qualities of the other (ascription) and the performances of the other (achievement). The question to be answered is whether the other is to be considered significant because of what he is—boy, girl, Negro, slum dweller, or because of what he does—reads well or poorly, responds, recites, *et cetera*. The informal peer groups tend strongly toward ascription as does the family and neighborhood.

The particularism - universalism distinction refers to the application of norms by the actors, and along with ascription - achievement describes one of the most fundamental distinctions between primary and secondary systems. Particularism describes normative expectations limited to a definite relationship between two particular persons —expectations that are not transferable to other relationships or persons. Universalism describes expectations that are generally applicable and which can be applied to status positions, independently of the particular persons involved. The universalistic expectations obviously define relationships between role players, not persons, and are consequently most relevant to requirements of secondary systems. The formal roles of the school. the expectations defining the role of teacher and students, are of this type and differ in this respect from the expectations applied to student peers. The critical effect of this distinction is that the school and other secondary sytems are understandable to actors only in the universalistic context.

The final distinction, collectivity orientation - self orientation, describes the degree to which the normative or cultural patterns permit individual or private interests, either expressive or instrumental, to enter into the considerations of the actor and his behavior. Collectivity orientation describes a situation, such as the classroom, office, or factory, where all the persons are obligated to pursue goals established by the group and held by all. Self-orientation describes a situation where the individual is permitted to pursue goals that are unique to himself and not shared by the other members of the group.

The relevance of all this to the problem of the disadvantaged arises from the fact that, with the exception of the family, the business of modern industrial society, from education through commerce, politics, religion to community affairs and recreation, is conducted in contexts of secondary rather than primary interactions. In this context, cultural conflict occurs because the lower class culture is characterized by primary rather than secondary modes.

Empirical Evidence on Lower Class Culture

The empirical evidence on the lower class culture is consistent with the distinctions made in the preceding discussion. As a comprehensive review of this evidence is beyond the scope of this paper, the reader is referred again to the cited references.

First, and at the cultural level, Miller and Riessman (19), in their outline of the themes of the working class subculture, assert that it can be described by the pattern variables of particularism-affectivity-ascription and diffuseness. These pattern variables alternatives of course define primary rather than secondary modes.

Secondly, there is considerable evidence that the interactions themselves fall in the primary rather than the secondary modes. The central aspect of this primary style is stated by Hauskencht (15), who, in his review of the empirical literature, draws the following conclusion regarding lower class interaction:

> The model for all social relationships is the family; that is, social interaction with others tends to be on a highly personal or primary basis. There is a shallow and minimum commitment to the more impersonal or secondary relationships demanded in most spheres of a complex society.....The home and the immediate neighborhood represent the "real world"; the journey to work represents a daily sortie into an alien world. (p. 209)

Blum (5), also writing in a survey and synthesis of the literature notes that the interactions and relationships occur in a close-knit network, or strong primary system, in which the behavior of the individual is effectively controlled, and where memberships (in secondary systems) are avoided because they must involve deviation from the norms of the strong primary system. This is, of course, the problem faced by the student who attempts to involve himself in the school in the face of the negative educational values and sanctions of the members of his peer reference groups who constitute his primary network.

Finally, at the level of personality and behavior, various authors have noted the importance of expressive rather than instrumental orientations in the lower class person and especially the lower class child (4, 24). This is another way of

describing a lack of role-taking skills that require ability to control impulses and to exhibit the self in the manner required by the group. Blum argues that this lack of role-taking skill is a result of the complete involvement of the individual in the close-knit primary network which prevents the learning of alternative behaviors and definitions of self.

Implications for Schools

Returning at last to the central problem, that of the disadvantaged child in the middle class school, the implication of the preceding is that the cultural conflict does not consist merely of discrepancy in content but rather that the conflict consists of patterns and styles that go to the very fundamental properties of social action itself. As Hausknecht (15, p. 207) states the contrast: "When compared with those of the middle-class, blue-collar beliefs, attitudes, and behavior represent not so much a subculture as a counter-culture." While Hausknecht may overstate the degree of conflict, it does seem clear that at the very least the disadvantaged child lives in a cultural context that has basic properties inappropriate to role playing in the middle class culture, and if socialization is accomplished in the lower class subculture alone the child will develop orientations and basic personality structure that will work against success in the middle class world of secondary systems.

As the dominant society is coming to realize, the school occupies a critical position in this process because it receives the child during the period when value-orientations are being acquired by the child and therefore can operate as a bridge between the two systems. However, instead of being a channel from the lower class subculture to the middle class system, the school actually seems to become another barrier that serves to stabilize the differences originating in the social structure. While there are obviously many factors involved in this failure to serve as bridge between the two worlds, and many of these appear to be matters of learning ability and capacity, value-orientations toward intellectualism, achievement, and work, the materials reviewed in this paper suggest that an important underlying factor might be simply the nature of the school as a secondary system. Thus, the school, in attempting to supplement the socialization content of the disadvantaged subculture, approaches the child as a secondary system with expectations that are alien to the experience and the normative orders within which the child lives. In other words, it is conceivable that the disadvantaged child cannot make contact with the school, not alone because he lacks the prerequisites to learning, but because he cannot behave in secondary contexts.

There is an interesting corollary to this implication, namely that the problem should become progressively more serious as the child progresses through the years when value-orientations and reference groups processes become more significant to him. In the very early years, all children exist within a primary context in the family where the orientations are consistently diffuse, particularistic, affective, and ascriptive. However, during the progression through grades, the child is taught to behave more and more in a secondary context and the teacher of course plays the central role in this development. "Thus to a much higher degree than in the family, in school the child learns to adjust himself to a specific-universalistic-achievements system." (22, p. 240) During the periods when the school is accomplishing this transition, the middle class child also acquires secondary orientations in the family as he is taught to behave in formal and semi-formal contexts, and he has parental models who behave successfully in secondary contexts. Thus the basic modes of interaction and behavior that he acquires in the family are congruent with the progression he is experiencing in the school. The lower class child on the other hand is acquiring a set of basic patterns that are quite different from those central to the school progression which, as Hausknecht states, stand counter to the middle class system and the school as a representative subsystem.

Given the above, it would be expected that the lower class child would be more involved in the school during the first year or so than in following years and that in each succeeding year would find the two worlds of school and family more disjunctive. If Blum's interpretation is correct, during these stages he will withdraw as much as possible from the secondary systems in order to maintain his status in the lower class primary network. As he does this, he probably disengages himself from meaningful involvement in the school as a secondary system, or involves himself most with the non-social aspects of the school, namely athletics and vocational training where the normative features of the middle class secondary system do not impinge as directly upon him. What he especially avoids are meaningful relationships with teachers and the secondary, middle class student networks centering around the school activities.

It is more interesting to note that the progressive deterioration of the academic achievement of the disadvantaged compared to the middle

class student can be accounted for by this model as well as by the generally accepted assumption that it is the academic learning failures in the early years which, because of the accumulative nature of the academic content learning, become progressively more consequential. Perhaps it is simply that as the child matures the discrepancies between the two cultures become more pronounced and damaging to the self.

Before proceeding to some speculations about ameliorating the effect of discrepancy in primary-secondary patterns, it might be well to place this particular problem in a more balanced perspective. To this point we have reviewed some of the social psychological factors in the cultural conflict between lower and middle class systems. Among these were such content features as different educational, occupational, and achievement value-orientations; differential experiences with disapproved behaviors; differences in socialization with respect to impulse control; achievement motivation; and assumption of responsibility. All of these factors have a significant role in the problem of the disadvantaged, the implications of which have been clearly drawn in the literature. This paper has developed the primary-secondary distinction because, to this writer's knowledge, the implications of that particular factor have not received much attention to the present time and because stating the problem in these terms opens the problem to interpretation from a social psychological perspective. However, the problem of the disadvantaged child in modern society and in the modern school system is most certainly multi-factored and will have to be examined from a number of perspectives.

Some Suggestions and Speculations

Without the empirical research testing of the actual effects of the primary-secondary distinction upon the academic success of the disadvantaged, the practical relevance of this paper to the immediate problems of the teachers of the disadvantaged is open to some question. However, in closing, some suggestions and speculations can be made although they are more in the way of hypotheses than solutions.

First of all, it is suggested that the primary-secondary distinction points to an area of concern that has not been adequately explored in the case of the disadvantaged but that should be carefully considered. It implies, as do many of the other aspects of the problem of the disadvantaged, that a student can possess both innate ability and satisfactory personal adjustment and still become a marginal student through the disjunctions of the social structures within which he lives. It most definitely does not view the disadvantaged as socially maladjusted, although some of the disadvantaged may be. It suggests most directly that the problem of the disadvantaged may not be so much that he *will not* become involved as that he *cannot* because he does not know how to act at the most fundamental and basic level of all—the general orientation to all action situations, regardless of content.

Secondly, and probably most realistically, the distinction suggests categories for teacher observation of the students. It is possible that these, as well as the other distinctions, will provide the teacher with new insights into the nature of the obstacles faced by the disadvantaged child in the school system.

Thirdly, this distinction should find its way into research on the disadvantaged to determine how important it actually is in the academic achievement of the disadvantaged, and for that matter in the academic achievement of certain middle class students.

Finally, the distinction suggests some possibilities in ameliorating the problem. If research or observations prove to be actually significant, then the school is faced with a choice. It can, as Riessman suggests, concentrate on utilizing the strengths of the poor, which are the strengths of primary systems, or it can attempt to "middle-classize" them by supplementing the socialization in secondary interactions they fail to receive in the family. As the strengths of the poor consist of the ego protection and support resulting from membership in primary systems, from the point of view of success in larger society, they actually constitute the major weaknesses of the lower class subculture. They are strengths only in the sense that in a modern society they provide ego support for the individual who cannot obtain success in the larger society of secondary systems.

If the choice is to "middleclassize" these children, then the primary-secondary distinction suggests some lines along which a solution might lie. This solution will necessarily be with the development of role taking and role playing skills. The school, as it attempts to supplement family socialization in this area, would have to provide the disadvantaged child with considerable amounts of practice in *playing at being* persons other than himself. Games of acting out, of being teachers, salesmen, policemen, of being other children, *et cetera,* would appear to be the type of approach

called for. The purpose of any such program would of course be to provide the child with experiences directed toward increasing his ability to be flexible in making presentations of self, in maintaining alternative definitions of self, and in assuming roles defined by situations, rather than by his internal needs. Any program of this sort should probably be directed toward ultimately involving the disadvantaged child in high school activities of a secondary type, and the early forms should be planned to lead to this result. Obviously, the earlier such trainings are instituted the more likely will be their success.

A closely related type of training should probably involve the development of understandings of and familiarity with secondary systems, and the central features of their operations. One way of doing this would be to have children make up games or other systems of action, to develop rules and acquire understanding of the relationship between organizational purposes, rules, or norms and the requirements of roles. Children might be given experience in assigning other children to positions and roles. In the later grades it might take the form of stating a function or goal and then letting individual children describe the necessary duties and responsibilities, establish positions, and assign other children to those roles. The nature of specialization, integration, and coordination of specialized roles; allocation of resources; and the necessity for controlling individual impulses could probably all be demonstrated and practiced in small group settings in the classroom. The purpose would be twofold—first to develop skill and understanding and secondly to gain insight into the manner in which the task requirements of secondary systems set the limits for individual behavior.

In the later grades and junior high school, study of society could concentrate on distinctions between primary and secondary systems and the basic patterns of modern society as a secondary system. In addition considerable attention should be directed toward meaningfully relating the features of the contemporary secondary system to the self, by showing how features of these systems affect the daily experiences and satisfactions of the individual. This is, of course, a much more difficult task than simple exercises in role playing. A most central feature of this education would be to show the nature of universalistic systems and how affective neutrality and specificity are related to these patterns.

The preceding are speculative suggestions and are not intended as recommendations for action programming. Such programming should properly wait on research designed to determine the actual importance of this distinction upon the academic and social experiences of the disadvantaged.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abrahamson, Stephen. "Our Status Systems and Scholastic Rewards," **Journal of Educational Sociology, XXV** (April, 1952), pp. 441-50.

2. Becker, Howard. "Social Class Variations in the Teacher-Public Relationship," **Journal of Educational Sociology, XXV** (April, 1952), pp. 451-65.

3. Bell, Earl and J. Sirjamaki. **Social Foundations of Human Behavior.** New York: Harper and Row, 1965. (Chapter 14, "Basic Designs of Social Systems.")

4. Bernstein, B. "Some Sociological Determinants of Perception," **British Journal of Sociology, VIII** (June, 1958), p. 160.

5. Blum, Alan F. "Social Structure, Social Class and Participation in Primary Relationships," in A. B. Shostak and W. Gomberg (eds). **Blue-Collar World.** Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

6. Bronfrenbrenner, Urie. "Socialization and Social Class Through Time and Space," in H. Proshansky and B. Seidenberg. **Basic Studies in Social Psychology.** New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965.

7. Broom, Leonard and P. Selznick. **Sociology.** New York: Harper and Row, 1965. (pp. 38-50, "Basic Patterns of Social Organization.")

8. Centers, Richard. "Motivational Aspects of Occupational Stratification," **Journal of Social Psychology,** 1948, XXVIII, pp. 187-217.

9. Chinoy, Eli. **The Automobile Worker and the American Dream.** Garden City: Doubleday, 1955 (Chapter IX, "The Chronology of Aspirations.")

10. Cohen, Albert K. **Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang.** Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955 (Chap. IV, "Growing Up in a Class System).

11. Coster, John K. "Some Characteristics of High School Pupils from Three Income Groups," **Journal of Educational Psychology** (1959), pp. 55-62.

12. Cloward, Richard A. and J. A. Jones. "Social Class: Educational Attitudes and Participation," pp. 190-216, in A. H. Passow (ed). **Education in Depressed Areas.** New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

13. Davis, Allison and R. J. Havighurst. "Social Class and Color Differences in Child-Rearing," **American Sociological Review, XI** (December, 1946).

14. Douvan, Elizabeth. "Social Status and Success Striving," **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LII** (1956), pp. 219-223.

15. Hausknecht, Murray. "The Blue-Collar Joiner," pp. 207-215, in A. B. Shostak and W. Gomberg (eds). **Blue-Collar World.** Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

16. Hollingshead, A. B. and F. C. Redlich. **Social Class and Mental Illness.** New York: Wiley, 1958.

17. Hyman, Herbert. "The Value-Systems of the Different Classes," in R. Bendix and S. Lipset (eds). **Class, Status and Power.**

18. Kohn, M. L. "Social Class and Parental Values," **American Journal of Sociology, LVIV** (1959), pp. 337-351.

19. Miller, S. M. and F. Riessman. "The Working Class Subculture: A New View," **Social Problems, IX, No. 1** (1961), pp. 86-97

20. Montague, Joel B. "Social Status and Adjustment in School," **Clearing House, XXVII** (1952), pp. 19-24.

21. Morse, Nancy L. and R. S. Wiess. "The Function and Meaning of Work and the Job," **American Sociological Review, XX** (1955), pp. 191-198.

22. Parsons, Talcott. **The Social System.** Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951, pp. 58-67.

23. Reiss, Albert J. and A. Rhodes. "The Distribution of Juvenile Delinquency in the Social Class Structure," **American Sociological Review, XXV** (1961), pp. 720-732.

24. Riessman, Frank. **The Culturally Deprived Child.** New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

25. Rosen, Bernard. "The Achievement Syndrome. **American Sociological Review** (1956), pp. 203-211.

26. Sewell, William and M. A. Straus. "Social Status and Educational and Occupational Aspirations," **American Sociological Review, XXII** (1957), pp. 667-73.

27. Toby, Jackson. "Orientation to Education as a Factor in the School Maladjustment of Lower-Class Children," **Social Forces, XXXV** (1957), pp. 259-266.

28. Vernon, Glenn M. **Human Interaction.** New York: Ronald Press, 1965 (Chapter 17, "Primary-Secondary Interaction.)

29. Wilson, Alan B. "Social Stratification and Academic Achievement," pp. 217-235, in A. H. Passow (ed). **Education in Depressed Areas.** New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

Compensatory Language Arts Programs for Disadvantaged Children

Continued from page 6

> quire one-third of the desks we now have in our elementary schools across the nation. The 20 million without a high school diploma would require that we double the number of desks in our high schools.[8]

No one claims that the elimination of illiteracy could cure all the evils of unemployment, discrimination, low standards of living, or problems of child-rearing. But there is no question that educational requirements are mounting. It has been found that the unemployed cannot even qualify for training or retraining, as the case may be, berause of their lack of education. An elementary education is not enough to qualify one for a job; already high school dropouts are having great difficulty in securing employment. Neither the fact that the attainment of functional literacy for adults is not a cure-all, nor the fact that illiteracy is diminishing, should mean that low educational attainment is not a matter for the deepest concern.

What the Child Brings to the School

What are some of the things which the child brings to the school, and most specifically, to the printed page? The most important of these are: (1) cultural and environmental backgrounds; (2) previous learning experiences; (3) interests at various developmental levels.

Educators are agreed that the content of reading materials should reflect the culture and environment of those to be taught. This idea is implicit in the special materials produced for use in compensatory programs and in the general patterns of learning accepted by educational psychologists. But these need to be examined against the situation in which we find vast numbers of children.

[8]*Ibid.*, p. 41.

There are 69,000,000 children in the United States under the age of 18. Of the 69,000,000 some 12,000,000 live in absolute poverty, which means that they have barely enough to subsist on. A vast number of these children cannot read, and the reason for a good many of them is that they do not believe there is any point in knowing how to read. Lack of reading ability is sometimes said to be related to crime. How many children commit crimes? According to figures provided for 1963 by the F.B.I., some 706,252 children were taken into custody; in that year in New York City alone police arrested over 40,000 children. Much of this could have been predicted—nay, had been freely predicted!

Using the Glueck Social Prediction Index, the New York City Youth Board began a study in 1952 which followed certain youth for no less than a decade. Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, in their book, *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*[9] had stated that it would be possible to determine at the age of five or six if a child would become delinquent or nondelinquent by considering five factors in the environment of the child. The Gluecks, working originally with boys, used the following factors:

> *Supervision by the mothers*: whether she knows where the child is and his activities and friends, and whether she keeps a close watch over him.
> *Discipline by the mother*: whether she sets limits for the child's behavior, whether punishment is kindly or cruel, and whether the child understands and accepts it.
> *Cohesiveness of the family*: whether parents and children enjoy working and playing together.

Originally there were five factors: those men-

[9]Published by the Harvard University Press, 1951.

In New York State, a delinquent is a person at least seven years old and less than 16 years of age who does an act which, if committed by an adult, would be a crime.